

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 were pending of which Claims 1-10 and 14-29 were rejected and Claims 11-13 were objected to. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 11, 14, 17, 20, and 21 have been amended, Claims 4 and 19 have been cancelled and Claims 31 and 32 added. Claim 11 has been amended to be in independent form is therefore allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103**REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 2, 4-9, 14, 15, and 19-22**

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 14, 15, and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Song et al. (US 6,552,754) ("Song") in view of Roddy et al. (US 6,648,475) ("Roddy"). Applicant requests reconsideration.

Song is related to a laser video projector system in which an "optical valve 8 formed from a liquid crystal display panel" is used "for filtering the laser beam emitted from the laser resonator 9 to a video screen." Col. 4, lines 49-51, 57-58, Figs. 4. Song uses a "color prism 30" to combine the light from the R, G. and B lasers 21, 22, and 23. Col. 6, lines 50-61. The use of the color prism 30 allows Song to combine the image information from the optical valves 8 and project the combined image to the projection screen.

Independent Claims 1 and 14 have been amended to recite "wherein the first filter and second filter are dichroic filters positioned orthogonally relative to one another" and dependent claims 4 and 19 have been cancelled. As discussed above, Song uses a color prism 30 and does not teach or suggest the use of "dichroic filters". Song could not use the "dichroic filters positioned orthogonally relative to one another" because Song is specifically directed to a projection system and the use of such a device would destroy a portion of the information to be projected to the projection screen. Specifically, the use of "dichroic filters positioned orthogonally relative to one another" would create a line through Song's projected image caused by the junction of the two orthogonal dichroic filters. Accordingly, the use of "dichroic filters positioned orthogonally relative to one another" would render Song's device unsuitable for its intended purpose. Applicant notes that Roddy suffers from the same deficiencies.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 and 14 are patentable over Song and Roddy for at least the above reasons. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this

SILICON VALLEY
PATENT GROUP LLP
2330 Mission College Blvd.
Suite 360
Santa Clara, CA 95051
(408) 982-8200
FAX (408) 982-8210

rejection is respectfully requested. Claims 4-9, depend from Claim 1, and Claims 15, 19, and 22 depend from Claim 14, and are, therefore, likewise patentable for at least the same reasons.

New Claims 31 and 32, which depend from Claims 1 and 14, respectively, recites "an integrator rod positioned to receive the combined light from the first filter and the second filter". Support for Claims 31 and 32 is found, e.g., in paragraph 16 and Fig. 1. Because both Song and Roddy are directed to projection systems, neither Song nor Roddy teach or suggest the use of an integrator rod that receives the combined light as that would cause all the image information to be lost.

Claim 2 has been made independent by incorporating the subject matter from Claim 1 from which the originally depended. Independent Claim 2 recite a collimator system including "a first collimator associated with the first light emitting diode" "a second collimator associated with the second light emitting diode" and "a third collimator associated with the third light emitting diode".

The Examiner stated that "Roddy teaches an uniforming optic (14) which is the functional equivalent to collimator." Applicant respectfully disagrees. Roddy discloses the use of a "uniformizing optics 14", which is described as providing "a uniform illumination field" and may include "any of a variety of lenslet arrays, integrating bar, or other optical components suitable for providing illumination over a sufficiently wide field for spatial light modulator 20." Col. 11, lines 41-44 and col. 12, lines 27-28. As is well known in the art, on the other hand, a collimator produces light that is approximately collimated. Accordingly, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, a uniformizing optic 14, as disclosed in Roddy is not a functional equivalent to a collimator. To the extent that the Examiner intends to persist with the present rejection, Applicant requests that the Examiner support this assertion with adequate evidence.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 2 is patentable over Song and Roddy for at least the above reasons. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. Claim 6 depends from Claim 2 and is, therefore, likewise patentable for at least the same reasons.

SILICON VALLEY
PATENT GROUP LLP
2350 Mission College Blvd.
Suite 360
Santa Clara, CA 95054
(408) 982-8200
FAX (408) 982-8210

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 3, 10, 16, 17, and 23-30

Claims 3, 10, 16, 17, and 23-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Song in view of Roddy further in view of Morgan (US 2005/0128441) ("Morgan"). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

Morgan does not make up for the deficiencies of Song and Roddy. Accordingly, Claims 3 and 10, which depend from Claim 1, Claim 16, which depends from Claim 14, are patentable for at least the same reasons as Claims 1 and 14.

Claim 17 has been made independent by incorporating the subject matter of Claim 14. Similar to Claim 2 discussed above, Claim 17 recites a recite a collimator system including "a first collimator associated with the first light emitting diode" "a second collimator associated with the second light emitting diode" and "a third collimator associated with the third light emitting diode". As discussed above, neither Song nor Roddy teach or suggest such a collimator system. Further, Morgan fails to make up for this deficiency. Accordingly, Claim 17 is patentable over Song in view of Roddy further in view of Morgan. Claim 21 depends from Claim 17 and is patentable for at least the same reason.

Claim 23 recites "the collimator system including at least three collimators". Claim 30 recites "a first collimator associated with the first light emitting diode" "a second collimator associated with the second light emitting diode" and "a third collimator associated with the third light emitting diode". As discussed above, neither Song nor Roddy teach or suggest such a collimator system and Morgan fails to make up for this deficiency.

Moreover, Applicant notes that independent Claim 23 recites "mounting a heatsink having at least three light emitting diodes to the frame, wherein mounting the heatsink aligns each of the light emitting diodes with an associated collimator in the collimator system". None of Song, Roddy and Morgan, alone or in combination teach or suggest "mounting the heatsink aligns each of the light emitting diodes with an associated collimator in the collimator system".

Thus, Applicant submits that Claims 23 and 30 are patentable over Song in view of Roddy further in view of Morgan. Claims 24-29 depend from Claim 23 and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons.

SILICON VALLEY
PATENT GROUP LLP
2350 Mission College Blvd.
Suite 360
Santa Clara, CA 95054
(408) 552-8200
FAX (408) 552-8210

Claims 1-30 were pending of which Claims 1-10 and 14-29 were rejected and Claims 11-13 were objected to. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 11, 14, 17, 20, 21 have been amended, Claims 4 and 19 have been cancelled and Claims 31 and 32 added.

Claims 1-30 were pending. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 11, 14, 17, 20, 21 have been amended, Claims 4 and 19 have been cancelled and Claims 31 and 32 added. For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 1-3, 5-18, and 20-32. Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this response, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (408) 982-8202.

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to the fax number 571-273-8300 on June 5, 2006.


Michael J. Halbert
Attorney for Applicant(s) Date of Signature
6-5-06

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Halbert
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 40,633

SILICON VALLEY
PATENT GROUP LLP
2350 Mission College Blvd.
Suite 360
Santa Clara, CA 95054
(408) 982-8200
FAX (408) 982-8210